UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/736,078	12/15/2003	Ting Tao	KPG-5094US	3247	
1333 PATENT LEG	7590 01/31/2007 ALSTAFF		EXAMINER .		
EASTMAN KODAK COMPANY			SHEWAREGED, BETELHEM		
343 STATE STREET ROCHESTER, NY 14650-2201			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
	,		1774		
SHORTENED STATUTOR	RY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE		
3 MC	ONTHS	01/31/2007	PAPER		

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

	•	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
		10/736,078	TAO ET AL.	
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
		Betelhem Shewareged	1774	
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication ap	pears on the cover sheet with	the correspondence address	5S
A SH WHIC - Exte after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLEMENTED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLEMENT IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DESIGNATION OF THE MAILING DESIGNATION OF THE MAILING DESIGNATION OF THE MAILING DESIGNATION OF THE MAILING ASSESSION OF THE MAILING DESIGNATION OF THE MAILING DESI	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICA 136(a). In no event, however, may a reply will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTH te, cause the application to become ABAN	TION. y be timely filed S from the mailing date of this community S from the Mailing date of this community S (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status				
•	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 f This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) This Since this application is in condition for allowed closed in accordance with the practice under	s action is non-final. ance except for formal matters	•	erits is
Disposit	ion of Claims			
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□ 8)□	Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) 11-20 is/are withdra Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or claim(s) are subject.	wn from consideration.	·	
	ion Papers			
10)	The specification is objected to by the Examin The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acceptable and any applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examin Theorem 1.	cepted or b) objected to by drawing(s) be held in abeyance ction is required if the drawing(s)	. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). is objected to. See 37 CFR 1	
Priority u	under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12)[ a)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureau See the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have been received. Its have been received in Appority documents have been re au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	lication No ceived in this National Sta	ge
A 1				
2)	et(s)  be of References Cited (PTO-892)  be of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08  br No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s)/N	nmary (PTO-413) Nail Date rmal Patent Application (PTO-152	2)

Application/Control Number: 10/736,078 Page 2

Art Unit: 1774

## **DETAILED ACTION**

Applicant's response filed on 11/13/2006 has been fully considered. The 35 UCS
 rejection has been withdrawn in view of Applicant's submission of Declaration
 Under 37 CFR 1.132.

2. Claim 11 is amended, and claims 1-20 are pending. (NOTE: Claims 11-20 are withdrawn from consideration as non-elected invention).

## Double Patenting

- 3. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).
- 4. A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.
- 5. Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).
- 6. Claims 1-10 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 3 and 5-7 of U.S. Patent No. 7,049,047 B2. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct

Application/Control Number: 10/736,078

Art Unit: 1774

from each other because current claims 1, 2, 3, 6 and 7 correspond to claims 1, 3, 5 and 7 in view of col. 7, line 1 of '047; current claim 5 corresponds to claim 7 in view of col. 10, line 36 of '047; and claims 8-10 corresponds to claim 6 of '047.

Page 3

7. Claims 1-10 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 and 13 of U.S. Patent No. 6,939,663 B2. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because current claim 1 corresponds to claims 1 and 13 of '663, and the sulfated polymer in claims 1-10 corresponds to claims 1 and 13 in view of col. 6, lines 8-17 of '663.

## Conclusion

- 8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Betelhem Shewareged whose telephone number is 571-272-1529. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Fri. 8:00AM-4:30PM.
- 9. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rena Dye can be reached on 571-272-3186. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/736,078

Art Unit: 1774

10. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

BS January 25, 2007.

> BETELHEM SNEWAREGED PRIMARY EXAMINER

Page 4